

**MINUTES
INDIANA BOARD OF FIREFIGHTING
PERSONNEL STANDARDS AND EDUCATION MEETING**

**June 13, 2013, 9am
Horizon Convention Center, Interurban Hall
401 S High St
Muncie IN 47305
765-288-8860**

A MEETING CALLED TO ORDER 9am

Introduce Jeff Gabbard, sitting in for the Fire Marshal.

Don Watson sitting in for Mike Garvey

B. ROLL CALL

Present

Jack Kerney Sr
Tom Hanify
Greg Wyant
Don Watson
Jeff Gabbard

Absent

Jeff Hayes
Candace Ashby
Mike Garvey
James Greeson
Burke Jones

C. April 29th 2013 MINUTES as submitted

Greg Wyant made a motion to approve as submitted. Tom Hanify seconded. Motion passed.

D. Proposed changes to the 655 IAC rules

Staff is submitting the proposed rule changes and asking the board to approve them. Legal counsel stated that the rule changes at this meeting would be for discussion only and we still had to file with the governor's office to be able to make rule changes due to the moratorium the governor has put on new rules.

1-1-5.2 We recommend limiting the certifications that require the use of Board approved curriculum to only Mandatory Firefighter, Firefighter I, Firefighter II, Safety Officer, Instructor I,

Instructor II, Instructor III, Hazardous Materials Awareness and Hazardous Materials Operations. The reason for the limitation is to ensure staff has the ability to complete the task of producing curriculum to the Fire Board. If you were to adopt the rule requiring curriculum for all certifications then IDHS staff would have difficulty producing quality curriculum for over thirty certifications.

1-1– 5.2 In the section requiring the use of curriculum we are asking the word curriculum to be changed to instructional plan and the staff is asking for these changes to be limited to the above certifications only at this time simply because we can't create what is required . These are the basic certifications, that are issued most often and taught the most often and once these are done, we will start adding other certifications.

Greg Wyant asked the board be allowed to discuss this one before we move on to the next

Jack Kerney asked attendees if they had any comments on this proposed change. Greg Wyant, board member, stated that this sounds like a good idea,. The fact that you are scaling back to these specific certifications before going on to the next makes sense and would allow staff to be able to have these in place at the time of the rule change.

John Buckman stated that this instruction plan would be a type of fill in the spaces; the objectives will already be laid out for the instructor. Anyone wanting to do one of these courses will simply fill the form out, submit it to staff for approval and this way there is a standardized document instead of a different document from every instructor. This way we know all objectives are being covered and the instructor is also aware of what they have to cover. Several of these are already being beta tested and I will have a report at the August meeting. Anyone that wants to help create these documents or beta-test these documents please contact staff.

1-1-13 – We recommend limiting the requirement for instructors to attend a train the trainer for only Mandatory Firefighter, Firefighter I, Firefighter II, Safety Officer, Instructor I, Instructor II, Instructor III, Hazardous Materials Awareness and Hazardous Materials Operations. We would like to have this limitation in place for the same reason as above.

1-1-13

We are limiting the requirements for the instructors to attend train to trainers to the certifications listed above for basically the same reasons. The instructors have to attend the train-the-trainer for each certification that they are wanting to teach. The train the trainer would be good for two years. You would not have to attend one every time you taught a class. Once you've attended one it would be good for the duration of the two years for that certification. This would also help staff know who the active instructors are, so when there are updates we can make sure that they get those.

Comments;

- An instructor has to attend each one of these that they want to teach or be lead evaluator for.
- If we have to do this, why don't they add it to the instructor course so that it can all be done there?

- What happens to the instructors that are not doing classes and teaching on a regular basis? There have been a lot of changes and we are not being notified on these changes. You guys have to find a way to let everyone know the changes not just the few.

Dave Provo: if you're not getting the bulletin, contact John Buckman give him your email address so that you get the weekly bulletins that include all new information updates, there is a lot of information in the bulletins and all instructors should be getting this.

This is primarily an IFSAC rule. IFSAC requires instructors and evaluators to attend training for each certification that they are teaching or evaluating. This is not the total reason behind it, but this is why we have to require it at this time. The train the trainer's purpose is so that evaluators and lead evaluators know exactly what has to be completed in order to meet the standard.

- An attendee made the statement that he was registered to teach a mandatory class and he got a letter from staff telling him that he was not eligible to teach this because he had not attended a train-the-trainer at that time. I was not aware that I had to attend a train-the-trainer in order to teach classes.

Question for legal counsel: is this one of the items that has to have a fiscal impact study completed on?

Answer: yes, when this rule gets submitted a fiscal impact report must go with it before it can be approved. The fiscal impact includes what it cost to individual to take the training, what it cost the department to put on the training and all this has to be included in the report

John Smith, a member of the Dubois County's Instructors Association, feels that a lead evaluator having to attend a train ~~to~~ the trainer for every certification is putting an undue burden on the instructor or on anyone wanting to be ~~in~~ an evaluator. We understand that the lead evaluator or ~~in~~ an evaluator must be proficient in the field that he is evaluating and we are not opposed to a lead evaluator or instructor having to take a train ~~to~~ the trainer every two years but we feel it should be one train ~~to~~ the trainer, not one for every certification that they are evaluating. The core should be more on how to evaluate courses instead of how to evaluate an individual on the individual certification. Teach it as a blanket training, they should be expected to know what to do how to complete the necessary paperwork and how to do evaluating but having to go through each and every one of the certifications there's not much difference.

Rick Compton; a member of the fire department, a state licensed teacher, and has been teaching since 1990. I have never been contacted to attend a train ~~to~~ the trainer. I was a military instructor and it was your responsibility to know how to do these things. How many people are going to be able to attend all these train the trainers? Many instructors have full-time jobs and they don't have the time to attend all of these. I personally have 36 years on at a fire department, I am retired, I don't have time to go to all of these train ~~to~~ the trainers. I have other things to do but yet as a schoolteacher I can still teach. I have a license to teach and you're saying I'm not qualified as a fire instructor because I have not attended train ~~to~~ the trainers? When I became an instructor years ago, you were taught that your job was to teach and to know the subject matter that you were teaching. Now you're saying that we have to attend all these different classes as instructors, and I am here to tell you that it is not what happens. You have too much outside activity to accomplish these task and you're making a burden on the instructors.

Legal counsel: Mr. Chairman, the one concern that I have is that if you do not require this, it puts the IFSAC certification at risk. That is the piece that I suggest the board keep in mind when you're making a decision on this. The board can decide that they don't want IFSAC, but if the board decides they want to keep it, then the train the trainers is a requirement. Tom Hanify stated that IFSAC seems to be important to the people that he has talked to. It seems to matter to people coming into the state. I'm not saying it is essential but it seems to be important.

Comment from attendee:

- As an instructor it is your responsibility to be familiar with the subject that you are teaching, you should not have to attend a train the trainers for every certification class that you're teaching. Incorporate trying to train the trainer in your instructor class; don't make us have to attend a train the trainer for every class. That is ridiculous, what happened to create one generic train to the trainer and be done with it.
- IFSAC does not say that you have to have a train the trainer every two years, staff just pick that year. We can change it to every four or five years when a standard changes so that the instructor is sure to get the update if there were any changes to the standard.

1-1-12 (I) – We recommend the Board to reconsider allowing seventeen year olds to take practical and cognitive examinations for certification. The reason for this is that it places a burden on staff and the students have not had very good pass rates. In addition it is questionable as to whether the programs in the state are able to successfully complete all of the practical skill requirements.

2013 Schools polled include: Elkhart Career Center, C9, J. Everett Light, Prosser, Indian Trails, IPS, Hoosier Hills, Muncie Career Center, and Southeastern.

1-1- 12 L

It's the one about 17-year-olds being able to take a written exam and do the skills we are asking the board to reconsider this. We are asking that you take this out of the rule and put it back to where variance requests are required. Part of the problem with this is the pass fail rate is awful. There's almost a 70% fail rate on all 17-year-olds testing. The other issue is department of labor. You are not supposed to allow 17-year-olds to operate dangerous equipment like saws. The only exemption is if you are part of technical program such as a career center. We cannot put in the rules that only vocational schools can do this. We are asking that you allow us to remove this from the rule rewrite and consider this on a base by base case. Jeff Burning's concerns is that all of our students will have to retake the course and the test after they turn 18 so they would end up actually happened do everything twice.

Staff is not saying don't do it, staff is saying that if you want to test at the age of 17 that you will have to go back to requesting a variance for it. A representative from the career school centers spoke; stated that the parents must sign a waiver for the students to do the practical skills so the parents are absorbing any liability. Greg Wyant, board member, stated that the pass fail rate doesn't necessarily mean anything, there are many people that get into this field and find out firefighting is not for them so the pass fail rate doesn't really influence him. Jeff Hayes Board Chairman, called in and stated that the Department of Education mandates these classes give a

certification test at the end of the class. They also state it has to be a state certification test. This is required in order to keep funding for these classes.

It was decided that this would warrant further discussion and it was to be on the August agenda.

E. Tom Hanify, Voluntary recertification for career FF ½.

This issue has been talked about for quite a while. It's been discussed several times at board meetings. I had a meeting, a one-on-one meeting with the mayor of Anderson and I was asked how I know you are a firefighter. I start explaining to him what I did to become a firefighter I know what is required to be a paramedic. He stopped me and said as a firefighter what are you required to do. So I started telling him what I do at the Indianapolis fire Department what my job is and he stopped me again and he said no as a firefighter what are you required to do. Then at the board meetings we start talking about continued education is a lot of discussion, lively discussions about the economic challenges and the staffing challenges in the time that it takes to do continued education. I started out as a firefighter in 1980 and looking back there is very little today that is the same was in the 1980s. Things changed. People need to know why they changed. Building construction standards have changed since the 80s and continued education would keep me up-to-date.

I am only discussing career firefighters; I am proposing for career firefighters only that they do 12 hours a year of continued education. This is voluntary only. What we came up with is this, if a fire department, whether it is a career or volunteer, if they were 95% or 100% compliant with this voluntary request, the fire department would get some kind of recognition whether it's a gold star or something from the state for them to post showing that they were compliant with this voluntary program.

I would be happy if all fire departments did this but that's not my role. I am talking about career departments only.

Jack Kearney stated if we do this, what have we accomplished? We will have two levels of certification. Those that do this program and those that don't, so what have we accomplished? Tom Hanify stated that when someone asks one of you what you have accomplished, this would show that these are serious firefighters. It's a form of accreditation just like you have accredited fire departments and you have non-accredited fire departments.

Comments:

- I personally, as a member of the volunteer fire department, don't have a problem with this. Its training we do every day
- The new ISO ratings require this so there's no reason other departments or all departments can't do this.
- As a member of the volunteer department I personally don't understand why any firefighter would be against continued training.

Tom Hanify stated that the system absolutely has to be voluntary because of the economy. This could possibly be a fiscal impact and we can't do that, which is why we are asking for voluntary

system. The equipment that is needed is already there, no department has to go out and buy new equipment,

Comment from audience

I looked under my PSID number, my old master categories were not listed there. Some fire departments don't consider that you have certification, if it's not on your PSID number. I myself took upon my own to contact Barb Goble, explained to her what I wanted and when I was on the phone right then right there she took care of it she had to dig into the old archives, find my records and she put them under my PSID number. It is each person's responsibility to make sure their records are correct and other certifications are listed under their PS ID numbers.

Question: if you're at a fire scene and you've got a hole in the roof would this count as part of the training?

Answer: No this needs to be supervised training.

John Buckman stated that if the board wanted them to meet with the union and volunteers get the parties involved in the instructors Association and develop a plan and come back to you, then the board needs to tell us what you want .

Tom Hanify asked that nothing be done with this today that this be advertised and put on the agenda for the August meeting. John Buckman asked the president of the IVFA if they wanted to be included in this discussion. The IVFA accepted the invitation.

F VARIANCE REQUESTS

1. Benjamin Renz requested a variance for instructor II/III based on ILEA instructor. Board requested a curriculum for the ILEA course. This is enclosed.

Staff recommends denial. Primary instructor can do needs analysis, but cannot act on it. The ILEA instructor does not meet the instructor 3 requirements.

Greg Wyant made a motion to approve staff recommendation. Don Watson seconded. Motion passed.

2. Jason Meek 3. Brian Bowden 4. Thomas Hagerty

5. Ryan Shambaugh

requested a variance for Driver Operator Mobile Water Supply. Brian Bowden signed as lead evaluator for all skills.

Staff is asking that Brian Bowden and Jason Meek be recognized as Lead Evaluators and skills be approved. Staff also recommends that the students take the state written exam.

Tom Hanify made a motion to approve skills as submitted and students pass the written exam. Greg Wyant seconded. Motion passed.

6. Dan Schoon requested a variance for Instructor I. He holds a valid Indiana teachers license.

Staff recommends approval pending his passing the instructor reciprocity test.

Tom Hanify made a motion to approve. Jeff Gabbard seconded. Motion passed.

7. Chad Gerardot requested a variance for Instructor I, II/III. He had completed testing in 2008 but failed to submit 30 hours of teaching. The board tabled this request pending further investigation.

12/2006	certified as instructor I
6/2008	completed the written exam for instructor II/III but was denied because he had not submitted 30 hours of documented teaching.
10/2009	recertified for instructor II/III but did not have it and hours used to recertify instructor I.
08/2012	recertified as Instructor II/III but missing evaluating hours and denied.
9/5/2012	resubmit hours for instructor II/III but did not have and not enough hours to recertify Instructor I
9/5/2012	resubmitted instructor II/III with evaluating hours but not enough teaching hours. E-mailed and explained that he did not have Instructor II/III and still lacked hours for recertification of instructor I.
9/10/2012	recertified as instructor I, still lacked 2 hours but staff recertified him.
4/2013	appealed to the Board for certification

Staff recommends denial of this certification.

Chad Gerardot spoke and requested to withdraw his request for variance.

8. Kevin Orme is requesting a variance for:

The Indiana Department of Corrections Michigan City prison desires to train and certify inmates who reside in our Michigan City facility to the mandatory certification level.

These are inmates who will reside with our facility for the foreseeable future.

Fire protection response is necessary part of protecting the population of the prison that includes employees as well as inmates. Trained and competent personnel are critically important to insuring that when a fire breaks out inmate staff can respond quickly and safely to rescue victims and extinguish the fire.

There are 15 inmates assigned to fire protection at the facility. They are overseen by a civilian State employee. The brigade is commanded by an inmate.

Our challenge in completing the mandatory training and skills portion is the vehicle extrication section.

These inmates will never leave our facility to perform fire suppression or rescue activity. We do not own or plan to purchase extrication tools for use at the prison.

I am requesting a variance from the requirement to conduct a skills assessment for the following skill: Extricate a victim trapped in a motor vehicle. (*NFPA® 1001, 6.4.1*)

I also have an inmate that speaks broken English. I am asking for a variance to allow this student to have the test read to him by a licensed teacher that works for the Indiana Department of Corrections.

John Buckman recommends approval.

Mara Snyder, Legal Counsel, spoke about concerns about certification being issued when all the skills are not being completed. This issue came up involving the career schools, and we had to stop issuing certifications until skills were completed. The other issue was the oral exam. This board has fought for the last several years to deny oral testing. If you do it for this, you are again opening the door. The notice says “for the foreseeable future”, what happens when they do get out? They will have a certification but they would not have completed all the skills. We also need the names of the individuals. We cannot just do a blanket approval for the prison system.

Tom Hanify asked if a certification could be created for Mandatory, excluding extrication.

Tom Hanify made a motion to table until August for further discussion. Greg Wyant seconded. Motion passed

G. REQUEST FOR RECIPROCITY.

No requests at this time.

H. REQUEST FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL

No requests at this time.

I. STATE FIRE MARSHAL, JAMES GREESON report given by Jeff Gabbard.

No report at this time.

J. HOMELAND SECURITY CHIEF OF STAFF MIKE GARVEY.

No report at this time.

K. CERTIFICATIONS REPORT, Barbara Goble

REMINDER:

- 1) certifications with the 11/11/1111 issue dates are not valid certifications
- 2) PSID numbers are required prior to testing

- 3) Use your portals to change address, phone #'s etc. Staff will no longer be doing this. If you do not have a portal, call staff and they will assist you in setting this up.

L STATE FIRE TRAINING DIRECTOR REPORT, JOHN BUCKMAN

REMINDER: as of June 1, instructor certifications will be renewed for 2 years instead of 3 and the hour requirements have changed.

1. Module testing report: (Dave Probo)

- a) Can you take specific sections of the module testing for certification purposes?
b) Modular Firefighter I/II Challenges and Questions
- c) We currently have two pilot classes underway and one set to start by the middle of June. A few questions have been raised that need to be addressed. People have inquired about personnel that are currently certified to various levels and if they can enter the system later as opposed to starting with Module I. For instance, if there are personnel who hold a mandatory certification can they skip Module I and/or II? IDHS Staff has reviewed this particular question and recommend the following;
- d) **Question** - Can personnel currently certified at the Mandatory level be permitted to enter into the modular system at Module II for the purposes of achieving a TRA, HMA, HMO or Firefighter I?
- e) **Answer** – No!
- f) **Justification** - Those who achieved the current or earlier mandatory certification completed a different set of skills. For instance, under the current mandatory there are

Current Mandatory	Skills	Modularized Mandatory	Skills
Ladder	6	Ladders	14
Hose	7	Hose	16
PPE/SCBA	6	PPE/SCBA	8

- g) If personnel were permitted to enter into the system at Module II there would not be a mechanism in place for them to make up those skills.
- h) **Question** – If personnel are certified as Mandatory or FFI/II can they take Module II only and receive Technical Rescue Awareness, Hazardous Materials Awareness/Operations?
- i) **Answer** – No!
- j) **Justification** - this could cause staff confusion should personnel be permitted to take the training and have the Lead Evaluator sign off on the skills but apply for the Hazardous Materials Awareness/Operations and Technical Rescue Awareness exams separately.
- k) Personnel currently certified to the Firefighter I level should be permitted to enter into the system at Module IV since this module is exactly the same as the Firefighter II certification. These personnel would be able to enter into a Firefighter II program and should therefore be permitted to take a Module IV class. This would allow those certified at Firefighter I and way to achieve the Firefighter II certification without having to wait for a Firefighter II class which are pretty rare.
- l) **Question** – Should Technical Rescue Awareness certification be required as part of the Module II portion of the Modular training program?
- m) **Answer** – Yes!

- n) **Justification** - Technical Rescue Awareness is designed for fire departments to educate their personnel of the hazards of technical rescue incidents. Technical Rescue Awareness include training in general hazards, rope rescue, confined space rescue, wilderness search and rescue, trench rescue, water rescue and structural collapse rescue incidents. In the awareness training it teaches personnel to recognize these types of incidents and educate them on the special hazards that are associated with each type. It also discusses legal requirements for organizations and why it is better to refrain from making rescue attempts and call for mutual aid with agencies that are trained to respond at the operations and technician levels.
- o) This program was put into the Module system because in the Mandatory statute it states;
- p) IC 36-8-10.5-7
Training subject matter
Sec. 7. (a) The education board shall adopt rules under IC 4-22-2 establishing minimum basic training requirements for full-time firefighters and volunteer firefighters, subject to subsection (b) and section 7.5 of this chapter. The requirements must include training in the following areas:
 - (1) Orientation.
 - (2) Personal safety.
 - (3) Forcible entry.
 - (4) Ventilation.
 - (5) Apparatus.
 - (6) Ladders.
 - (7) Self-contained breathing apparatus.
 - (8) Hose loads.
 - (9) Streams.
 - (10) Basic recognition of special hazards.
- q) Based on our interpretation of item (10) we feel this training will provide adequate training in the basic recognition of special hazards.
- r) The reason this question has been raised is that this program adds 16 hours of training to Module II and people feel this is too much to complete. Ultimately this ruling falls to the fire board, however, before rendering a decision we ask that you consider that responders are injured/killed each year due to a lack of awareness training and will cite those organizations for a lack of awareness training. In OSHA 1910.156 it states;
- s) **1910.156(c)(1)**
- t) The employer shall provide training and education for all fire brigade members commensurate with those duties and functions that fire brigade members are expected to perform. Such training and education shall be provided to fire brigade members before they perform fire brigade emergency activities. Fire brigade leaders and training instructors shall be provided with training and education which is more comprehensive than that provided to the general membership of the fire brigade.
- u) Therefore, if a fire department is called to respond to a technical rescue incident and has not provided their members with the appropriate training then they have placed their membership at undue risk. We ask that Technical Rescue Awareness continue to be part of Module II.

M ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS, JUDGE BIPPUS

1. Administrative Cause 13-01, Dennis Musgrave, appealed denial of variance for Fire Officer III and IV.

Tom Hanify made a motion to approve the certification. Don Watson seconded. Motion passed. Greg Wyant abstained from the voting.

N OLD BUSINESS

1. Book committee status, no report
2. Board interpretation of IC 36-8-10-5.7 (a) Basic recognition of special hazards. This would pertain to both the module and regular classes.

a) Basic Recognition of Special Hazards Definition

- b) The ability to be aware of and recognize situations and determine appropriate defensive action where a potential cause of injury or death is present because of a particular process, building or activity such that where civilians are at risk and that could increase the risks to responders normally associated with response or require special equipment or procedures not normally a part of responder basic training.

3. Hazmat operations needed for Firefighter I certification.
No discussion on this issue at this time. will be on the August agenda.

O NEW BUSINESS

P. MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING:

August 9th 2013, 6pm
Indiana Government Center South
302 W Washington St.
Conference Room C
Indpls IN 46204
317-232-2325